

# Communities of Opportunity Design Committee Meeting Notes

---

*June 23, 2014*

*Attendees: Gordon McHenry, Dean McColgan (Solid Ground), Matias Valenzuela, Hilary Franz, Michael Brown, Laurie Sylla, Judy de Barros, Aaron Robertson, Jennifer Martin, Kirsten Wysen, Michael Woo, Dinah Wilson, Kristen Weber, Sarah Ross-Viles, Alice Ito, Kathleen Austad (Sound Cities Association), Deanna Dawson, Nilofer Ahsan (CSSP), Frank Farrow (CSSP), Holly Rohr Tran.*

## **Welcome and Review of Agenda**

**1:30 p.m.**

## **Desired Result and Guiding Principles of Communities of Opportunity – building on our discussion from 4/21/14 meeting**

**1:40 p.m.**

Ten Seattle-King County representatives (including several from this Design Committee) attended Living Cities Learning Community in Chicago last week.

Representatives worked there to develop the existing COO Vision (To improve health, social, racial and economic equity) into a more specific Results Statement and Guiding Principles that will inform those joining the work later on. Group members were asked to respond to the draft Statement and Guiding Principles and offered the following input:

- Change “disparities” to “inequities”
  - Clarify/reconsider “highest in the country” language: want to foster collaboration, not competition, with other places around the country doing equity work. Intent was to communicate that in seeking equity, we don’t want the top deciles (which reflect some of the best health outcomes in the country) to drop, but want to raise the lowest areas to the level of everybody in the top-ranking deciles.
  - Consider more positive language – “Promote/create health, social, racial, and economic equity” instead of “Eliminate...”
  - Add “economic” back in
  - For guiding principles; call out race
- This feedback will be incorporated, and the Results Statement and Guiding Principles will be brought back to each subsequent meeting to either reaffirm or refine.

Kirsten Wysen discussed the distribution of racial groups in the south King County areas.

- Below is a summary of the percentage of different race/ethnic groups living in the 20% of census tracts highlighted in COO maps. Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic and American Indians are about twice as likely to live in these places; 84% of white King County residents do not live in these areas.

Race/ethnic category	Total in King County	Total in 80 census tracts	Percent of total in 80 census tracts
Pacific Islander	15,838	7,881	50%
Black	127,210	54,643	43%
Hispanic	181,065	68,533	38%
American Indian	20,379	6,950	34%
Multiple	95,101	21,199	22%
Asian	294,336	59,472	20%
White	1,404,136	228,227	16%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,957,000</b>	<b>378,372</b>	<b>19%</b>

Kirsten Wysen also reviewed the [Summary of Living Cities Integration Initiative Learning Community](#), focusing on the *Revised large scale result* section.

- Identifying examples of intersections/systems integration opportunities (win-wins or win-win-wins) is on the agenda for this group’s August meeting.

Other observations/takeaways noted by Learning Community attendees:

- Changes could take 10-20 years to manifest.
  - Solutions implemented must be able to adjust to changing community circumstances.
- Change cycle graphics were helpful, would be good for this group to use in their conversations with others
- Collective Impact is potluck, not poker. Participants should be chosen based on what they can bring to the table.
- Cross-sector collaboration is not just this table; how can we continue to build out the circle, bring others (business, etc.) in? How do we continue to morph relationships?
  - Would be helpful to have the same talking points about COO when connecting with different audiences such as communities, leaders and the private sector.

### Lessons learned about site selection from other initiatives nationally (Center for the Study of Social Policy) 2:15 p.m.

Frank Farrow, CSSP, shared the Lessons Learned About Site Selection handout, noting that it is an art, not a science. Frank expanded on the handout with the following points:

- Regarding *Clarity of results* as noted under Elements of site selection, Frank further offered:
  1. If there are non-negotiables up front, name them!
  2. Important to spell out indicators
  3. Set of indicators as core, for communities to add to

4. If capacity building is one of the desired results – be somewhat specific about what this is.
  - Be clear about how communities are involved in structuring community engagement
  - *Exploring fit and making decisions* is all about relationships (not a science). Take your time with this.
  - Ask communities their expectations for the funder.

The group also discussed how to involve other communities that are not be selected for funding, and may consider convening/funding a learning community to spread the benefit across the region. Frank noted that in the example of HUD’s work, data drove their selection: used data to have conversations with mayors before the RFP was released.

### **Neighborhood/City Selection Criteria and Process Discussion – Small Group Discussions** **2:30 p.m.**

At last meeting, this group discussed the initial systems/policy RFP. Those investments will connect with the place-based investments and impact each other in an iterative fashion.

Attendees broke into 3 small discussion groups. See questions and discussion summaries noted below.

### **BREAK** **3:20 p.m.**

### **Report and synthesis of recommendations – Large Group Discussion** **3:30 p.m.**

1. *Initial identification process sand early engagement of sites*
  - a. *How will we advertise the opportunity?*
    - Framing is important re: areas doing well, areas not doing well. Use trend data.
    - Explaining how this helps all of us
  - b. *How will we identify the pool of eligible sites? Focus on south Seattle and south King County?*
    - 1<sup>st</sup> overlay: race+income+place (health)
    - 2<sup>nd</sup> overlay: capacity (to be defined)
    - South end of County. The group wasn’t sure how best to frame/communicate this.
  - c. *Who will finalize selection criteria and process?*
    - Consider tiering communities based on needs; planning , implementation, capacity building, peer learning
    - Recommend mutual selection process – co-design process and have be a strategic planning process for community – caveat of timing
    - Begin with Design Committee (which has lots of connections in the community)
    - Make less top-down
    - Part of co-design/strategic planning process aligned with other place-based initiatives
    - Beginning the larger body of work with the community
    - Note timing
    - Design committee should make final selection

- d. *What will we communicate with sites re: actions required?*
- e. *What resources will be made available?*
  - What we bring to sites - menu
  - What sites can expect from us – interview potential sites for needs info
  - What we expect from sites – being well-positioned to become backbone
  - Form learning community and provide technical assistance to others in the County. Consider how much will be offered and how to leverage TA going on under other initiatives.
- f. *How will success be measured?*
  - That a fair, equitable and transparent process took place

Thoughts and reactions from the larger group:

- Consider a community/neighborhood's strengths as part of selection criteria
  - Need to be more transparent about the "something else" that's informing selection area of south King County, so that communities can screen themselves out and avoid wasted effort/frustration. Perhaps add another "layer" to the map
  - Allowing these resources to build an equity piece in an existing initiative is an intriguing idea
2. *Characteristics and capacities for a city or neighborhood that would make it a good fit for the initiative*
- a. *What would be the characteristics of a city/neighborhood that would make this initiative a good fit for that site?*
    - Concentration of people of color
    - Health and social and economic indicators
    - Reach? Impact? Numerical, political, other=long-term change?
    - Identified issue: Demonstrated/willingness to work/engage others
    - Collaboration – history of "table" to make change
  - b. *What underlying capacities are needed to support effective implementation?*
    - Current ability to engage/mobilize constituency
    - Range of capacity (credibility, trust, sustainability):
      - Be at table
      - Could be held accountable by community
  - c. *What commitments to this work would we like to see from the city of neighborhood?*
    - Political will (if needed) vs. roadblocks – who's on board, champion
    - Commitment to issue beyond this funding source
    - Funders commitment to long-term support – others?
    - What does this look like from the community's side?
    - Values of community engagement – what and how to resident leaders role
    - Leverage other resource, \$\$, people
    - Commit to pulling together "table"

Thoughts and reactions from the larger group:

- Observation from national perspective: in places where equity policies are passed alignment is created between policy makers and community orgs. It also provides a mechanism by which community orgs can hold policy-makers accountable. This might be the kind of thing we'd want to support – a local community an equity policy in place.
- Collaboration history (doesn't have to be immediately on the proposed issue) shows there is capacity in that community to make some movement. A group's history of trust-building is foundational.
  - Need to find some specific indicators of trust building.
- Maybe the "B" team can study what made the "A" team successful – this info can be part of the learning community. Could also be part of the leveraging resources piece.
- Commitment to contributing to the data could be part of the "potluck."
- Commitment to the continuous improvement process.

### 3. *Decision-making process*

#### a. *Sequence and timing for soliciting a proposal*

- Sensitivity to "neighborhood" leaders – different expectations for grassroots?
- Pre-selection necessary (alignment)
- Avoid multiple submittals – avoid "lose"
- Mutual selection is preferred
- Assessment of mutual interest, in-person & local
- Short-list of 5-10 to enable 2-3 sites chosen
- Transparency of process, critical. Manage expectations as far as # of sites to be chose and range of \$
- Try to give at least 30 days to respond
  - how aggressive can we be to give sites more time?
  - How much TA will be offered, and who is providing it?

} Need to gain understanding  
of community perception of  
root cause(s)?

#### b. *Who should be involved in the final selection?*

- The Seattle Foundation
- King county
- Neighborhood/community (no conflicts of interest)
- Chamber
- Education
- Youth
- Other(s)?

#### c. *What will be immediate follow-up steps after sites are selected?*

- Determining who else in the community needs to be at the table (post-award).  
Need to have folks there at the beginning of the process.

Thoughts and reactions from the larger group:

- How can we give folks enough time? Is 30 days enough time for folks do form a response in a collaborative way?
  - Can we push out the timeline?
    - Sense of urgency in maintaining momentum
  - Can we fast-track and/or stack some processes on the funder's side between proposal due dates and award announcements to allow more response time?
- Pre-selection process might allay some of these concerns.
- Review not just written applications, but conduct site visits. How do we reference check with others in the community?

## Closing and Next Steps

4:15 p.m.

- These small group discussions will be summarized and circulated for edits/additions.
- Based on this work, a subgroup will circulate a proposal as a basis for discussion at July 21 meeting
  - Hilary Franz, Alice Ito, Gordon McHenry and Judy de Barros volunteered to discuss the week after July 4.

Anticipated July 21 agenda:

1. Place-based investments process overview, framing and timeline
2. Governance Structure options proposed by TSF/KC leadership
3. Evaluation and outcomes –systems/sector intersections
4. [addition proposed at June 23 meeting] –Options for community representative time compensation

A short survey was distributed by Laurie Sylla – this feedback can be used to inform process.

***Next meeting: July 21<sup>st</sup> from 9-noon at the 2100 Building (Community Room A),  
2100 24th Ave S, Seattle, WA 98144***

## Lessons Learned About Site Selection, 6/23/14, CSSP, Frank Farrow

### Purpose

- To share the experiences from other foundations and public sector initiatives as they've identified cities and neighborhoods with which to partner
- To identify ways in which this early process of engagement with communities can help empower communities to make choices and reflect Communities of Opportunity's commitment to equity and relationship building

### Perspective

- No one right way to do this, but the process is important, as it will be viewed as a reflection of the values of the initiative
- Thinking about the process as *mutual selection*. This is an opportunity for cities and neighborhoods to obtain the information they need to decide whether participation will help them achieve their goals for equity.
- Shifting from "site selection" to creating the basis for strong partnerships between funders and communities

### Initiatives that observations are based on

- The **Building Neighborhood Capacity Program (BNCP)**, of the U.S. Departments of Justice, Education, Housing and Urban Development, HHS, and Treasury
- **Building Healthy Communities**, The California Endowment
- Various initiatives of the **Annie E. Casey Foundation**

### Elements of site selection – and thoughts about what seems to work best at each step

1. **Clarity about results**
  - Being clear about the desired results for an initiative at the onset
  - Leaving room for community priorities and results to be equally important as those of funders
2. **Determining need and fit with goals**
  - Deciding on the data that will define communities' fit with the aims of the initiative
  - Trend data, versus single points in time
3. **Defining community characteristics and capacities that are important for success**, that will play a role in community selection, and that communities need to know about in order to decide if the initiative is a good fit for them
4. **Developing an invitation to communities**
  - Several options:
    - Inviting a pre-selected group of communities who meet the definitions of need and capacity
    - Competitive processes
      - Single step process (i.e., distributing a competitive RFP to all eligible communities)

- Multiple step process (i.e., identifying a smaller pool of communities, based on need and capacity; asking if they are interested; determining interest; inviting some to submit a full proposal)
- 5. Exploring fit and making decisions**
  - Importance of site visits and direct dialogue with community leaders about purpose, results, fit, commitments
  - Advantage of multiple perspectives in the review
  - Clarity about how final decisions will be made
- 6. Throughout the process: communicating thoroughly and transparently**, including about how all communities will have the opportunity to learn and benefit from the funded communities' work

### Summary observations

- The importance of clarity about purpose, desired results and how results will be measured
- Creating community choice throughout the process
- Assuring that communities are set up with the conditions of success from the start
- Being clear upfront about what happens after selection: is there a planning period? Initial implementation? What type of support will there be for communities as they get started? On-going support? Peer learning among communities?
- Expected speed bumps: what can cause the process to go off track?